



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/597,239	06/20/2000	Kiyoshi Suzuki	PNDF-00040	5864
30743 7	590 12/29/2005		EXAM	INER
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			KASSA, YOSEF	
SUITE 340				PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, VA	20190		2623	-

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/597,239	SUZUKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		YOSEF KASSA	2625			
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTO WHICHEVER IS LONGER, - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mai - If NO period for reply is specified ab - Failure to reply within the set or exte	FROM THE MAILING DA under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ling date of this communication. ove, the maximum statutory period w nded period for reply will, by statute, r than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (Set a). In no event, however, may a reply be rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO date of this communication, even if timely for	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
	2b)☐ This is in condition for allowar	ctober 2005. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are p 4a) Of the above clair 5)□ Claim(s) is/are 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are p 7)□ Claim(s) is/are 8)□ Claim(s) are s	n(s) is/are withdrawe allowed. ejected. e objected to.	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is ob 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed of Applicant may not required Replacement drawing s	n <u>20 June 2000</u> is/are: a) est that any objection to the cheet(s) including the correct	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTC2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent 3) Information Disclosure Statement Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2625

# Final Action Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment/argument filed on October 05, 2005 has been entered and made of record. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons. Applicant's argues that setlak references did not disclose a plate adjacent to the fingerprint reading portion or adjacent to the cover for the fingerprint reading device or on which a finger must be placed to open the cover. The Examiner disagrees. Please refer to col. 6, lines 22-26 of Setlak '804, bled from the finger as the cover 53 of Fig. 4, is moved to expose the sensing portion of the sensor 30 of Fig. 4, clearly shows that the finger charge bleeding or removing static electricity stored on a finger of a user performed as user moving the cover. Applicant's argues that setlak references did not disclose a plate which must be firmly engaged by the finger of a user in order to open the cover or in the course of doing so. The Examiner disagrees. Please refer again to col. 6, lines 22-26 of Setlak '804, bled from the finger as the cover 53 of Fig. 4, is moved to expose the sensing portion of the sensor 30 of Fig. 4, clearly shows that the finger charge bleeding or removing static electricity stored on a finger of a user is performed as user moving cover, also refer to Fig. 2, finger of a user engaged on the movable cover to open, and further note that the cover is a pivotally connected cover. Applicant's argues that setlak references did not disclose the discharge path from pad 53 and while it serves to bleed static charge from the finger is not connected to ground but, rather, to a resistor 104

Art Unit: 2625

across which the signal of interest is developed. The Examiner disagrees. Please refer to col. 6, lines 12-17 and Fig. 4, note that applicant's admitted that bleed static charge form the finger is performed via a resistor which is connected to the ground, and additionally applicant's recognized that a resistor 104 across which the signal of interest is developed, which clearly shows that the signal of interest is the static charge bleed form user finger which directed to the ground as finger engage on pivotally connected cover. Applicant's argues that setlak references did not disclose a lock releasing button is formed of conductive material and connected with ground. The Examiner disagrees. Please refer to col. 6, lines 16-26, broadly reads on a pivotally connected cover which is connected to the ground see Fig. 4, because it is well known to have or incorporate lock/button on a cover, wherein the cover element comprises finger charge bleeding means. Therefore, combination of the Setlaks reference clearly meet all the claimed invention.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Setlak et al (U.S. Patent 5,940,526), and further in view of Setlak et al (U.S. Patent 6,259,804).

With regard to claim 1, Setlak 526 discloses removing static electricity stored on a finger of a user, i.e., finger charge bleeding, (see col. 3, lines 18-24) through a plate on finger print reading apparatus adjacent finger print-reading portion (see col. 3, lines 39-51) prior to putting his finger on a fingerprint-reading portion (see col. 3, lines 58-67).

Setlak 526 does not disclose expressly for removing static electricity stored on a finger while obtaining access to finger print reading portion by movement of a structure for covering finger print reading portion when not in use. However, in the same field of endeavor, Setak 804 discloses this feature (see col. 6, lines 17-26). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Setlak 804 finger charge bleeding process into Setak 526 system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to remove the charge from the finger by contacting the opening to the exposed upper dielectric layer of fingerprint sensor device.

Claim 2 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 1.

With regard to claim 3, Setlak 526 discloses forming said cover of conductive material (see col. 5, lines 6-9), connecting said cover with a ground (see Fig. 4, item 53' connected to the ground), and conducting static electricity to a ground via cover when said cover is opened by said finger of user (see col. 6, lines 38-47).

Claim 4 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 1. Except, the additional limitation of "situating plate on a position on which user puts finger to open cover" see col. 5, lines 43-47.

Claim 5 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 1. Except, the additional limitation of "removing static electricity stored on finger of a user when user opens a main cover or another apparatus" see col. 5, lines 40-47.

Claim 7 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 1. Except, the additional limitation of "a cover which closes fingerprint reading portion when fingerprint reading portion is not used" see col. 5, lines 40-47.

Claims 10 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 7.

With regard to claim 6, Setlak 526 discloses another apparatus is provided with a lock releasing button which is formed of conductive material and connected with a ground, and said static electricity stored on said finger is removed via a lock releasing button when said user opens said main cover of said another apparatus (see col. 6, lines 17-26, which broadly reads on the opening feature or pivotally connected cover).

With regard to claim 9, Sitlak 526 discloses conductive material is metal (see col. 6, lines 19-24).

Claims 12, 15 and 18 are similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claim 9.

With regard to claim 20, Sitlak 526 conductive material is plastic containing carbon fibers therein (see col. 6, lines 50-65).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Application/Control Number: 09/597,239 Page 6

Art Unit: 2625

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Setlak et al (U.S. Patent 5,940,526), and further in view of Fujiwara et al (U.S. Patent 6,310,683).

With regard to claim 8, Setlak et al is silent about conductive material is conductive resin. However, in the same field endeavor, Fujiwara teaches this feature (see col. 11, lines 20-26). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a fingerprint reading apparatus as taught by Fujiwara in the system of Setlak et al because Fujiwara provides Setlak et al system a process of reducing an optical loss in reading a fingerprint, eliminating positioning among the respective components and improving the productivity.

Claims 11, 14 and 17 are similarly analyzed as claim 8.

Claim 13 is similarly analyzed and rejected the same as claims 1 and 3. As to the additional limitation of a main cover which is provided with a display, this feature is taught by setlak et al (see Fig. 1, item 53).

Claims 16 and 19 are similarly analyzed as claim 13.

#### Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (571) 272-7452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JINGGE WU can be reached on (571) 272-7429. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communication and (571) 273-8300 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2625

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

### **PATENT EXAMINER**

Yosef Kassa

12/22/2005.

SAMIR AHMED PRIMARY EXAMINED